DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 001 SO 001 233

TITLE	Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter. Number 10.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	8p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Education Consortium, Social Science Building, 970 Aurora, Boulder, Colorado 80302 (Single Copies, Free; Quantity Orders, $.20)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Games, *Curriculum Development, *Educational Trends, Elementary Grades, Inservice Teacher Education, Interdisciplinary Approach, *Newsletters, Preservice Education, *Simulation, *Social Studies

ABSTRACT

Consortium teacher associates interviewed individuals and groups involved in the production of social studies curriculum materials. Three basic trends were hypothesized and tested: 1) a pronounced movement away from materials based on single discipline structures and cognitive content, and toward multi- and cross disciplinary studies with emphasis on modes and processes of inquiry, values, and value conflict; 2) a greater emphasis on teacher training as an integral facet of projects from their inception, rather than during their dissemination phase; and, 3) publishers reacting to the impact of the major projects by paying more heed to such aspects of curriculum development as rationale, objectives, teaching strategies, field testing, and teacher training. In addition, Robert Bilek discusses briefly current research on social studies games and simulations and the commercial interest in them. Those interested in receiving the newsletter regularly should request that their names be put on the mailing list. (Author/VLW)

ED050001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Social Science Education Consortium

NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 10 | Supported by the National Science Foundation | May 1971

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Social Science Education Consortium
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

SO 001 233

A REVOLUTION COMES OF AGE: SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN THE SEVENTIES

Michael A. Radz and C. Frederick Risinger

Michael A. Radz and C. Frederick Risinger are two of the three Teacher Associates on the SSEC staff during the current school year. Radz is on leave from the Webster (New York) Central School District, where he is chairman of the Social Studies Department of R. L. Thomas High School. Risinger, also a secondary department chairman, is from Lake Park High School in Roselle, Illinois.

The overarching objective of the Social Science Education Consortium is to encourage and support creative, cooperative work among social scientists and educators in the development, use, analysis, and evaluation of elementary and secondary social studies curricula. As one means of achieving this end, the SSEC has gathered in its Resource Center one of the most complete collections of social studies curriculum materials in the country. Every effort is made to keep the files on the numerous projects as current as possible.

A related concern is the maintenance of communications between the Consortium, social studies curriculum developers, and practitioners in the field. The SSEC Teacher Associates (TAs) are significant links in this network. By means of correspondence, phone conversations, and personal visits, the TAs perform the dual service of acquiring new information and materials and keeping open avenues of communication.

Before and after the November 1970 National Council for the Social Studies convention in New York City, the three current TAs made 19 visits to individuals and groups in the eastern United States involved in the production of social studies curriculum materials. This two-week trek resulted in a 65-page report summarizing the visits.

In the course of formal and informal discussions of the reports with the SSEC Boulder staff, it was noted that three significant trends in the development of curriculum materials appear to be emerging. Each of these observations became, in effect, a hypothesis about likely directions for social science curriculum development in the 1970s.

First, there is a pronounced movement away from materials based on single disciplines—their structures and their cognitive content—toward multi- and cross-disciplinary studies, with emphasis on modes and processes of inquiry, values, and value conflict.

Second, projects are placing a greater emphasis on teacher training. Indeed, teacher training is becoming an integral facet of projects from their inception, rather than receiving emphasis only at the later, dissemination, phase.

Finally, publishers are reacting to the impact of the major projects by paying more heed to such aspects of curriculum development as rationale, objectives, teaching strategies, field testing, and teacher training.

Although the November visits provided some evidence of the emergence of these trends, it was our feeling that additional inputs were required before a supportable statement on trends in social studies in the '70s could be made. Accordingly, the authors decided to contact 16 additional authorities who are or have been intimately involved in the development of social studies curriculum materials. A letter explaining the background of the investigation and presenting a set of questions related to the three hypothesized trends was sent to each of the 16 developers. The questions were designed to be specific enough to focus on discernible trends, but general enough to allow the respondents freedom to develop their own predictions. Individuals were advised that, within a week of receipt of the letter, they would be contacted by phone and asked for their reactions. In each case, the respondents agreed to allow us to tape the conversation. Following the interviews, we analyzed the tapes, searching for data that would support or refute our three hypothesized trends. The persons interviewed are listed at the end of the article.

The '60s: Origins of Change

A brief historical overview of the past decade will be useful, to place the emerging trends in perspective. At the risk of oversimplifying a period of time that witnessed dramatic and complex transformations in the very fabric of American education and society, we suggest that three concurrent forces interacted to generate the thrust for the '70s in the methods, materials, and foundations of social studies curriculum development and implementation. American society, in the 1960s, was a society in search of itself. Numerous forces were at work, pulling in a bewildering variety of directions, with people individually and collectively asking, "Who am I?" and "Where am I going?" On the one hand, it was a decade of polarization, as youth confronted elders, as blacks and other minorities sought equality with and respect from the white majority, and as the conflagration in Southeast Asia produced dramatic political and social confrontations. On the other hand, in

their concern for human relations, peace, and the quality of life and the environment, Americans discovered that the basic question was not the ends but the means. As we enter the new decade we can only speculate about the answer to the question posed by Martin Luther King, in the mid-'60s, "Where do we go from here, chaos or community?"

A youth culture emerged in the 1960s. The young raised questions which profoundly affected society. Basic institutions—the family, the church, the schools—were challenged by the young, who were no longer willing to passively accept that which had been venerated by previous generations. In their refusal to be bound by the conventional concepts of morality and political, economic, and social democracy, the new generation despised apathy, decried complacency, and denounced the status quo. Indeed, youth demanded reform—and it is hardly surprising that one of their initial targets was the schools.

Not only youth, but also many concerned individuals and groups, were subjecting the entire educational structure to a thorough reexamination. By the end of the decade, reform and innovation seemed to prevail, as educators sought to find new ways to facilitate learning. While some administrators pointed proudly to new physical plants specifically designed to create a new learning environment, alternative schools were springing up in basements, storefronts, and abandoned school buildings. Team teaching, programmed instruction, modular scheduling, differentiated staffing, the open classroom, and the extended school year were visible evidence of the ferment in education. The pleas for more humane schools made by Goodman, Holt, Kohl, Kozol, and, more recently, Silberman, came to sound less like the criticism of romantics and more like consensus. As far as curriculum was concerned, students and teachers began to assert that for content to be meaningful, it had to be "relevant;" that is, in tune with the world outside the classroom.

The social studies curriculum was one of the last academic areas to respond to the pressure for change; but once the movement began, it was dramatic. With Bruner's *The Process of Education* in one hand and money from the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and private foundations in the other, social scientists and educators marched forth and created what came to be called "the new social studies." Numerous curriculum projects across the nation began to develop materials that were based either on the structure of a single discipline or on an interdisciplinary framework forged from the major concepts of the social sciences. Nearly all sought to involve the student actively in the teaching-learning process. Much attention was devoted to the sequential ordering of content and skills. Influenced by Bloom, Krathwohl, and Mager, curriculum developers placed a new emphasis on the construction of well-defined objectives. To an unprecedented degree, social scientists from colleges and universities cooperated with classroom teachers in developing, testing, and revising new materials.

Keeping Up with the Students

Our interviews with the 16 expert consultants helped to round out our views on what had happened in the '60s and to test our hypotheses about trends developing in the '70s. Our consultants confirmed our view that, as the '60s drew to a close, social studies was moving in significant new directions. Much had been accomplished in a relatively short span of time. However, as James Shaver warned in his telephone interview, "You can be on the right track and still get run over if you are moving too slow."

One of the "right tracks" would appear to lead toward a social studies curriculum that students see as more realistic and more consistent with their perceptions of the world outside the classroom. Donald Oliver and John Gibson stressed the necessity for materials that students can easily see are related to their own experiences, interests, and needs, but noted that the majority of materials coming from the project centers have emphasized the structures, concepts, generalizations, and modes of inquiry of specific disciplines. According to John Haas, teachers are reporting that their students simply are not relating to materials of this type. Instead, they are concerned about the nature and problems of the society in which they live. John Jarolimek and Nicholas Helburn see the social studies classroom of the '70s extending into the community, as students not only demand and receive a more realistic view of society, but also seek to translate their concern into social action.

Many young people have lost faith in the change mechanisms provided by the American system. The problem, as Mark Krug sees it, is that traditional civics and other social studies offerings have told students what the system is and how it is supposed to function. The more sophisticated, informed student of today, however, perceives that the ideal is not the reality, and concludes that other alternatives for change must be employed. Krug argues for programs which lead students to an awareness of how the system actually operates, imperfect though it may be.

C. Benjamin Cox sees the concern of the young about social problems as one of the major determinants of the social studies curriculum in the coming decade. Because today's students will not buy the disciplinary approach, Cox predicts the demise of discipline-related projects. "They [the young] have other matters to teach us which are more important." Thus, Cox joins Helburn, Jarolimek, Krug, Haas, and Shaver in forecasting a social studies curriculum which is both sensitive and responsive to the students' genuine concern for societal problems.

Howard Mehlinger notes that many of the new materials were designed for traditional rather than innovative classrooms and schools. However, the curriculum developers of the '60s were not unaware of the changes occurring at that time in society and in education. While Cox predicts "changes that will make the 1960s look like a mistake to some," he is quick to note that the '60s should not be interpreted as a series of errors, since "that thrust was needed to build a foundation for us to go in different directions." Clearly, the decade of the '60s was both a period of change and a period of transition.

The Legacy of the '60s

Although our personal and telephone interviews seemed to confirm our hypotheses concerning the reorientation of social science curriculum development, they also indicated that the impact of the 1960s has been profound and would continue through the 1970s.

The "thread" of the '60s most frequently mentioned as a continuing, significant attribute of social science curriculum development is the "inquiry" mode of guiding student

learning. Although definitions of the inquiry method have not been completely agreed upon, nearly all of the social science educators contacted agree that it will continue to be the dominant strategy for student activities. Development of materials that require the student to examine and analyze data, generate hypotheses, and evaluate generalizations must go hand-in-hand with the development, by curriculum projects and publishers, of materials encouraging flexibility of implementation and individualization of instruction.

The question in the minds of many of those interviewed, including Cox and Barry Beyer, is whether teachers have the knowledge and skills to utilize the inquiry approach effectively. Beyer goes so far as to suggest that, with a few exceptions such as minority studies, "the bulk of the innovative [development] work is already done. We have more materials than we need." He maintains that the crucial problem now is the ability of teachers to translate the intended inquiry strategies of the curriculum developers into successful classroom tactics.

Although it is clear that there is a significant movement away from emphasis on the structured concepts and generalizations that marked the early "new social studies" movement, many of the respondents feel that the structure of the discipline will still provide the foundation on which further innovation will be built. While few agree with Marion Rice's contention that "the pendulum will swing toward more structured programs which emphasize the acquisition of basic skills and knowledge," several educators, including Jarolimek and Paul Brandwein, feel that concepts will continue to provide a core for curriculum development. However, both Jarolimek and Brandwein forecast that the consideration of values and the process of valuing will be the key ingredient of the "newer" social studies, while the structure of the social sciences will serve primarily as a rational base for the exploration of values and social valuing processes.

Other trends of the '60s—which are likely to continue into the '70s, possibly with increasing emphasis—are multimedia approaches and paperback, single-unit materials packages. These changes in the format of materials have resulted from the developers' commitment to providing more varied, relevant, and exciting learning activities, as well as from the classroom teacher's desire to have materials which allow flexibility and individualization.

These continuing "threads of the '60s" do not alter the apparent movement of social studies curriculum development in the 1970s toward a period of significant change, both in design and content. At least two of the social science educators interviewed, Mehlinger and Cox, describe the present time as an "extended dialectic" in which the humanistic and the structure-of-the-discipline movements are moving toward a synthesis which will result in renewed vigor for social studies curriculum development.

Testing the First Hypothesis

There is a pronounced movement away from materials based on single disciplines—their structures and their cognitive content—toward multi- and cross-disciplinary studies, with emphasis on modes and processes of inquiry, values, and value conflicts.

The primary reason for this shift in emphasis and approach can be traced directly to the growing disillusionment, on the part of many of those concerned about social studies innovation, with the impact of the new materials. Curricula and curriculum materials based on the structure-of-disciplines approach are, as Mehlinger puts it, "simply not powerful enough to effect change" to the degree that had been hoped. Both Helburn and Haas contend that future funding by the National Science Foundation, the United States Office of Education, and other organizations will radically deemphasize curriculum development based on purely cognitive learning or on single disciplines, such as geography and economics. Harold Berlak sees the move away from this kind of curriculum development as a natural reaction to overemphasis on cognitive curriculum development in the 1960s. The early curriculum projects were, in his words, "based on the assumption that the schools were intellectually barren and that the source of true knowledge rested with the social scientists." But, as Berlak points out, many of those who were in the vanguard of the early "new social studies" revolution "never asked . . . knowledge for what?" As a result, many of the curricula developed during this period were intellectually sound but still failed to get at the heart of education, because they neglected the nature of the learner and the learning environment.

This last point brings us to one of the predictions most frequently encountered in our research. Nearly every social scientist and social studies educator contacted feels strongly that curriculum materials developed in the next decade will put a strong emphasis on the individual and his interaction with society through interpersonal relationships, and with value-oriented societal issues such as war, feelings of alienation, and environmental decay. Many of those interviewed base their forecasts on American society's apparent realization that human relations and values are at least as significant as cognitive forms of learning, if not more so.

The emphasis on value clarification and the development of personal values related to broad societal issues was emphasized particularly by those people who are concerned with "humanizing" the total school environment and promoting the study of individual value analysis and decision-making. Shaver, Oliver, Berlak, and Gibson have been developing curriculum materials concerned with value conflict and analysis since the early 1960s. Shaver pointed out that the trend toward examining values in the curriculum does not really contradict the older emphasis on the structure of specific disciplines. Both Shaver and Berlak view the next decade as a time for drawing these two strands together and developing curriculum programs that will be intellectually sound and yet call upon the students to consider, analyze, and make personal decisions regarding both societal and individual values. Helburn, while agreeing with this overall prediction, pointed out that social studies education in the elementary and secondary schools has always been concerned with values. However, the method in the past was to "indoctrinate or inculcate" a set of values that had been preselected by the materials producer and the teacher; the goal now is to provide students with skills which will allow them to personalize their own value analysis and decision-making.

Toward Multi- and Cross-Disciplinary Studies

Accompanying the development of materials based on a humanistic approach to values and the process of valuing is a trend toward developing multi- and cross-disciplinary materials combining all the social sciences on the one hand

or the social sciences, and the humanities on the other. Indeed, many of our respondents suggested that the time of the individual discipline-based social studies curriculum may be drawing to an end. Cox predicts that the discipline-related project materials "will be forgotten in five years," and Helburn, former Director of the High School Geography Project, says that a funding proposal for another single-discipline effort like the High School Geography Project would probably be turned down by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Office of Education.

The reaction away from single-discipline materials is engendered both by a demand on the part of the schools and a realization on the part of curriculum developers that an integrated, humanistic approach to social studies education is more realistic and more effective than a fragmented program based on single-discipline courses. The coordination and combination of the social sciences with the humanities is receiving more and more emphasis—perhaps because, as Shaver points out, "the humanities provide a particularly relevant source for social studies content. The content that interests any of us is that which helps us deal with our sphere of reality." This emphasis on social reality requires that social studies content consider man as a totality, including his art, literature, music, and other creative endeavors, as well as those aspects generally included within the sphere of the social sciences.

The trend toward multi- and cross-disciplinary curriculum development based on humanistic approaches to interpersonal relationships and value-seeking, the concurrent trend toward individualization of learning, and the vast changes being predicted for the school environment, seem to support and give added impetus to each other. Our original hypothesis related to the trend toward values, cross-disciplinary studies, and personalization of the social studies curriculum is overwhelmingly supported by the social scientists and social studies educators contacted.

Testing the Second Hypothesis

Teacher training is becoming a more integral facet of curriculum development and will, in the future, be important from a project's inception.

Our second hypothesis was supported by every individual that we interviewed. While there was consensus on the hypothesis as stated, there were varied reactions to the question of why this trend would characterize future curriculum efforts, what the focus of teacher training should be, and who would assume the responsibility for training. Several project directors—notably Gibson, director of the Lincoln Filene Center's elementary-level Intergroup Relations Curriculum, and Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, co-director of ECON 12—indicated that their projects had always viewed the teacher as the key to the successful use of the materials, and hence, they had built in teacher training from the beginning. However, as Haas observed, many of the projects "learned belatedly that preservice and inservice should have been considered at the outset rather than at the dissemination stage."

It appears that the most reasonable explanation of the renewed concern for teacher training is simply that the experience of the '60s showed that even carefully selected classroom teachers had difficulty with the new materials and the methods used in these materials. As Krug observes, "The emerging emphasis on teacher training is a simple result of the realization that just publishing the most attractive packets of curricula, the most ingenious, the most inventive and imaginative materials, is heading nowhere unless we train teachers to use them." Malcolm Collier supports this view. She notes that the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project (ACSP) operated under the assumption that as teachers actually taught the materials, they would, in effect, be training themselves. However, Collier concedes that experience has proven that the ACSP staff was overly optimistic on this point.

The problem, as Beyer sees it, is that teachers have not been trained to use inquiry techniques as developers had intended. The result has been the use of conventional methods with innovative materials and the resultant impact has been limited, if not negative. Since Beyer, Jarolimek, Brandwein, and others foresee a continued trend toward inquiry, it would appear that teacher training in the future will, of necessity, focus to a far greater extent on modes of inquiry as compared to content.

No one disputes the necessity of teacher training and, as Krug emphasizes, retraining. The unresolved issue appears to be who shall assume the responsibility for this function. Berlak asserts that teacher training must be a local matter, for "national projects, no matter how well conceived, cannot direct teacher training throughout the country." Perhaps in recognition of this point of view, Richard Brown's Amherst Project is concentrating its efforts on working with local school districts to develop materials designed to "foster the conditions necessary for inquiry learning in the schools" and to help these districts train teachers to develop and implement new materials that will reflect the philosophy and local conditions of the school district. However, Mehlinger observed that school districts are poor and getting poorer. It follows that inservice training is not likely to become a priority budget item, as desirable and necessary as this may be. The harsh reality is that the various instructional areas within a school system are in competition for funds. Social studies must vie with science, mathematics, and other departments for a slice of the inservice allocation. Unfortunately, this means that inservice training will continue to be a kind of "crisis" budget item in which money is allocated to controversial or new programs such as sex education and environmental programs.

Who Will Assume the Responsibility?

Jarolimek sees the responsibility for teacher education being borne by a consortium composed of teacher trainers in the universities, local districts, and professional associations. Such an approach would provide the desired continuum of professional growth. Cox, however, envisions a diminished role for the university. He sees the local school district assuming the burden for teacher training in conjunction with state departments of education. In this arrangement, teacher training will take place in the field, with local districts cooperating with the state in the administration of certification procedures.

Publishing companies have been active in sponsoring workshop programs. Most respondents, however, expressed skepticism about the willingness of publishers to invest substantial sums of money in teacher training. Undoubtedly, efforts of this type will continue on a limited basis, since publishers recognize the sales value of workshops. It could well be that publishers will follow the example of the High

School Geography Project and its publisher, the Macmillan Company, in developing teacher education kits instead of, or in addition to, sponsoring teacher training workshops and institutes.

Mehlinger described an approach at Indiana University in which preservice teachers are trained in curriculum development as well as in methods, thus requiring college methods teachers and curriculum developers to work more closely than they have in the past. Haas and Jack Cousins at the University of Colorado and Thomas Fitzgerald at Temple Buell College in Denver are using project materials as the content in their social studies methods courses.

Shaver expressed a slightly different concern. While he, too, is very much bothered by traditional approaches to the preparation of teachers, he is convinced that the rationale for education is being neglected. He asserts that "we can turn out people who can do all sorts of things, but they won't know why they are doing them." The result, as he sees it, is that "the unexamined content of the past has continued on as the revised, but unjustified, curriculum of the present." Thus teachers must be trained to make reasonable choices when faced with alternatives.

Teacher training poses a baffling question. Everyone concedes it is a problem and a consideration that must be viewed as an essential ingredient in the total process of curriculum development; however, it is evident that the individuals we interviewed are not in agreement as to how the problem should be solved.

Testing the Third Hypothesis

Publishers have felt the impact of the major projects and are reacting by paying more heed to such aspects of curriculum development as rationale, objectives, teaching strategies, field testing, and teacher training.

It appears that some publishers are now entering the social studies curriculum development field with the same frame of reference as did the curriculum projects of the 1960s. Some companies, such as Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, have formed adjunct organizations which are similar in design and objectives to the funded projects. Such materials as Harcourt's *Concepts and Values* program and Field Educational Publications' Social Studies Program, directed by Richard Gross and John Michaelis, devote large amounts of effort and space to the rationale, objectives, modes of inquiry, and teaching strategies that form the philosophical and pedagogical bases for the materials. These underlying components comprise about 60 percent of the *Concepts and Values* program's total product, according to Nancy Bauer, chief social studies consultant to Paul Brandwein of the Center for the Study of Instruction, which developed the program. The student materials constitute the remaining 40 percent.

Unlike our first two hypotheses, the third hypothesis yielded a dichotomy of opinion which became readily apparent in the course of our investigations. While many of the social scientists and social studies educators that we interviewed feel that publishers have been influenced by the curriculum projects to a significant degree, only a few felt that publishers would pre-empt the fields of development, field testing, and training. The most common reaction that we received was stated well by Nicholas Helburn. "Generally," he said, "publishers have been a force for tradition, not for innovation." Shaver echoed these sentiments and said that publishers tend "to produce only what the public wants" and therefore will find it very difficult to assume a leadership role in curriculum development. On the other hand, Cox and Haas tend to agree with the hypothesis. Cox predicted that organizations like Harcourt's Center for the Study of Instruction will become more commonplace and that publishers "will capture the market" by hiring the social scientists and educators who formerly were associated with funded projects. Haas foresees increasingly more sophisticated forms of field testing and revision of experimental materials by publishers as a result of the experience and impact of the projects of the 1960s.

Several of those interviewed, notably Krug, offered warnings concerning the degree to which publishers should enter the curriculum development field. Krug, along with Suzanne Helburn and others, fears a loss of autonomy and freedom to experiment as a result of the publishers' overriding concern for economy and profit. To enter into "too close" an arrangement with a publisher is "potentially dangerous," says Krug. Conversely, Brandwein and Berlak, two curriculum developers who have worked closely with private publishers, contend that this danger is more fiction than fact. Brandwein maintains that he has "more freedom with a publisher than [he] ever had with a university." Suzanne Helburn agrees that this may be the case in some instances, but argues that funding by the National Science Foundation and U.S. Office of Education provides even more freedom and will result in more innovative and creative curricula.

In short, while we did not find complete support for our third hypothesis, we feel the available evidence does indicate that the role of the private publisher in social science curriculum development is increasing and will continue to do so. Perhaps this is a consequence of the "lessons of the '60s" or perhaps simply a result of the withdrawal of federal support for materials development. But for whatever reason, it appears safe to predict growing involvement by private companies from the inception of materials development, and not just in the final dissemination stage.

Conclusions

At the outset of our research for this article we identified three hypotheses about directions for social studies curriculum development in the 1970s. The information that we gathered as a result of our interviews not only tends to support our hypotheses but also suggests that the winds of change are blowing more strongly than we had at first thought. More importantly, it appears that the changes in direction and content that we forecast are a consequence of vast psychological and social changes that are taking place throughout American society and the American educational system. An individual's personal feelings, self-awareness, and interaction with his society are now becoming at least as significant as an accumulation of factual knowledge and mastery of cognitive skills. These two facets of learning represent the two forces that several of our respondents viewed as conflicting trends within a dialectic. If, as Mehlinger and Cox contend, this is indeed an unfolding dialectic process, we can anticipate a merging of the "new social studies" of the '60s with the trends noted in this article. The result will be a synthesized social studies of the '70s, characterized by a more flexible, broadened curriculum which will be more responsive to the needs of the individual

and society and yet firmly constructed on an intellectually sound foundation provided by social science structure and learning theory.

These types of curricula will obviously be more difficult to develop and it will be even more difficult to measure and evaluate their effectiveness. We must agree, therefore, with Mehlinger when he says, "The task is greater and more complex than that of the '60s." But we also feel that these complexities and challenges will inevitably contribute to an exciting era from which creative and meaningful materials will emerge.

Consultants

Berlak, Harold
Metropolitan St. Louis Elementary Social Studies Project, Washington University

Beyer, Barry
Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum Center, Carnegie-Mellon University

Brandwein, Paul
Center for the Study of Instruction

Collier, Malcom
Anthropology Curriculum Study Project

Cox, C. Benjamin
School of Education, University of Illinois

Haas, John
Center for Education in the Social Sciences, University of Colorado

Hartshorn, Merrill
Executive Secretary, National Council for the Social Studies

Helburn, Nicholas
ERIC/ChESS, formerly Director of the High School Geography Project

Helburn, Suzanne Wiggins
ECON 12, San Jose State College

Jarolimek, John
President, National Council for the Social Studies, and School of Education, University of Washington

Krug, Mark
Schwartz Citizenship Project, University of Chicago

Mehlinger, Howard
High School Curriculum Center in Government, Indiana University

Michaelis, John
Field Social Studies Program, and School of Education, University of California, Berkeley

Rice, Marion
Anthropology Curriculum Project, University of Georgia

Senesh, Lawrence
Our Working World, University of Colorado

Shaver, James
Professor of Education, Utah State University

GAMES ARE GROWING UP

Robert C. Bilek

Robert Bilek is currently a Teacher Associate for the Social Science Education Consortium. He is on leave for the academic year 1970-71 from Salinas High School in Salinas, California where he is Social Studies Department Chairman. Bilek has focused much of his attention, while at the Consortium, on the study of educational games and simulations.

Sarane Boocock, creator, researcher, and recognized authority on games and simulations for the classroom, has hinted that game design is not a science—it is hardly a craft —but rather, an "art" in the sense that there are no explicit rules to follow in order to develop successful games. Like developers, researchers find that they, too, have no ready-made guidelines for their tasks, such as evaluating the worth of educational games. Researchers who have attempted to find empirical evidence about the effectiveness of games in the classroom readily admit that they are floundering in their infancy. They still have not found the right questions to ask. For what little data exist, there is yet no taxonomy or classification system that is really meaningful. However, as the data begin to accumulate, we seem to be building toward a breakthrough in understanding this potentially powerful learning device.

Current Research on Games and Simulations

Paul Twelker, President of the American Council on Educational Simulation and Gaming and Associate Research Professor with the Oregon State System of Higher Education, feels that simulation and gaming is to the 1970s what programmed instruction was to the 1950s. He has written and is presently seeking funding for a project that would answer two questions:

1. How can we establish guidelines for the evaluation of simulations and games or for the evaluation of curricular programs that include simulation and gaming?
2. How can we measure the competencies required of an individual who uses, designs, evaluates, or diffuses simulations and games?

Major Alan Thoeny and Captain Frank Horton of the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado, are also assembling data. After 15 years of experience, they feel they still know little about the efficacy of games in their classrooms. Though they believe that concept learning is perhaps the most important outcome of games, they are not sure they know how to test adequately for this. Recently they devised a set of questionnaires for gathering empirical data on the results of simulation and game participation. One of the questionnaires is directed to players, while the other is directed to teachers who have used games in the classroom. They are attempting to gather data from a broad cross-section of the country, but the complexity of their forms may restrict their use to relatively few classrooms.

Ron Stadsklev, Professor at Concordia Teachers College Laboratory High School, Seward, Nebraska, has wrestled with the problem of game evaluation for the past three years. He has constructed a Games Analysis System for interpreting data from persons who have participated in gaming activity, usually in conjunction with his workshops. The instrument is easy to use and Stadsklev does a good job of describing each question to the users before they give their ratings on a one to ten scale. Data from each respondent are of greatest value when used in comparison with other data from the same respondent on other simulations. Much of this research will serve as a basis for the games and simulations section of the forthcoming SSEC publication, the *Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book*.

"Hunches" About Games and Simulations

Perhaps the greatest impetus to practical research has come from Garry Shirts of Western Behavioral Sciences Institute and Project Simile II, located in La Jolla, California. Shirts has spent considerable time in classrooms viewing teacher-created simulations. (He strongly recommends the creation of simulations by teachers.) His article in the

March 1971 issue of *Social Education* describes some games being used in elementary classrooms. Many researchers have been moved to action by Shirts' flier entitled *Hunches,* available from Simile II, which deals with games and simulations. In summary, he says:

1. Maybe simulations are "motivators". . . .
2. Maybe a simulation experience leads students to more sophisticated and relevant inquiry. . . .
3. Maybe simulations give participants a more integrated view of some of the ways of men. . . .
4. Maybe participants in simulations learn skills: decision-making, resource allocation, communication, persuasion, and influence-resisting. . . .
5. Maybe simulations affect attitudes. . .
6. Maybe simulations provide participants with explicit, experimental, gut-level references about ideas, concepts, and words used to describe human behavior. . . .
7. Maybe participants in simulations learn the form and content of the model which lies behind the simulation. . . .
8. Maybe the main importance of simulations is their effect on the social setting in which learning takes place. . . .
9. Maybe simulations lead to personal growth. . . .

It is difficult to envision a true researcher reading these "hunches" without whetting his appetite for researching many of them.

Commercial Interest in Games and Simulations

Commercial producers, like Simile II in La Jolla, believe that there is a real future in the gaming market. However, those private organizations that have entered the field of game development within the last four years are feeling the financial pinch of defeated school tax elections as well as the cutbacks of federal aid for the purchase of school supplies. Typical is Games Central Division of ABT Associates in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Specialists associated with this "think tank" wrestle with concepts, develop models, formulate roles, and finally put together simulations which they test and offer for sale to curriculum projects and individual producers. Ray Glazier, Director of Games Central, stated that ABT has tried to get its game division out of the red by selling its own products, thereby eliminating the middleman and increasing its own financial returns.

Academic Games Associates, at John Hopkins University in Baltimore, has recently formed a separate agency to sell some of their gaming products, which formerly were sold to curriculum projects and individual producers. Samuel A. Livingston, who has done considerable research for this organization, notes that there has been a proliferation of small companies that have tried their hand at game production; however, much of what such companies have to offer is of little educational value. To properly produce a game takes considerable testing and refining, which some companies are not prepared to do.

Solid Achievement or Passing Fad?

Games and simulations are still delicately balanced on that fine line between solid achievement and passing fad, both as educational devices and as commercially viable products.

There are many questions yet to be answered about the effectiveness of games in the classroom: What are their outcomes? How can we measure achievement of outcomes? Do games achieve their objectives as well as or better than other approaches? Do games achieve some desirable outcomes that other approaches do not? Though enthusiasm for educational games and simulations is growing, we have not accumulated enough evidence to know if that enthusiasm is really justified.

Commercial developers of games and simulations are finding that the market for these novel educational devices may not be great enough to support commercial production. Though there is much verbal enthusiasm for gaming, this is not matched by available funds in shrinking school budgets. Because of the substantial investment involved in the development of good educational games and simulations, these devices are expensive—perhaps too expensive to make them worthwhile. If we knew better exactly how worthwhile games and simulations were in terms of educational "payoff," we might be better able to judge how much we are willing to pay for them.

RECENT AND UPCOMING MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

Administrators' Conference. On May 6-7, six administrators from the home districts of the three SSEC Teacher Associates attended a workshop-conference designed to serve as both a summary of the Teacher Associates' experiences this year and a preparation for their return to their home school districts. Participants included Robert Binns and John Carolan, from Salinas, California; Ross Willink and Joseph Klimschot, of Webster, New York; and Carl Forrester and Eugene Swierczewski, from Roselle, Illinois. The two-day program included reports from the Teacher Associates, planning sessions to determine future directions for the social studies departments in the three schools, and consultation sessions with members of the Boulder SSEC staff.

National Science Foundation Leadership Training Workshop. SSEC staff members will assist the Center for Education in the Social Sciences, University of Colorado, in conducting a National Science Foundation Leadership Training Workshop July 4 through July 28, 1971. The sessions will include four concurrent workshops, each offering extensive training in one of four specific curriculum projects: Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, ECON 12, High School Geography Project, and Sociological Resources for the Social Studies. Seven major cities in the United States will each send a team of 16 people. Teams will be composed of one social studies methods professor from a local university or college, three administrators from the city's school system, and 12 secondary social studies teachers.

Heavy emphasis will be placed on implementation of the four curriculum projects in the seven city school districts represented. Thus, the criteria for selection of cities include the willingness of a city to implement the packages in a specified number of classrooms, the degree to which other innovative programs are supported by the city school system, and the financial commitment of the school system for funding implementation of the new materials.

Conference for State Social Studies Specialists. The SSEC received funds in December 1970 from the National Science Foundation to host a one-week conference for state social studies specialists. Fifty-five specialists have been invited to attend—one representative from each of the 50 states,

SSEC
SOCIAL SCIENCE BUILDING
970 AURORA
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302

and one each from Washington, D.C., the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, and Alberta and Ontario, Canada. Dates of the conference are June 28 to July 2, 1971. Directed by James E. Davis, SSEC Staff Associate, the conference will focus on recent developments in social science education. Participants will learn about production, use, and evaluation of the newest classroom materials, explore new directions in social science education, and be assisted in developing skills needed to perform their functions as planners, resource persons, advisers, facilitators, and coordinators.

1971 NCSS CONVENTION

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) will hold its annual convention from November 22 through November 26, 1971, in Denver, Colorado. The theme of the conference will be "Society in Crisis: Why Are We Divided?" The participants will focus on the problems of decision-making, social action, and the social studies teacher as an agent of change.

The Program Committee for the 1971 conference has provided a variety of preconvention activities of both an educational and a recreational nature, including a number of clinics which will study in depth several of the "Society in Crisis" topics that will be developed during the convention itself in general sessions and a sequence of assemblies. There will also be two days of "Do Your Own Thing" sections presenting a broad range of topics of interest to the social studies educator. The program planners have made a special effort to provide both outlet and input for the diverse interests of NCSS members.

The SSEC and ERIC/ChESS will provide pre-session workshops, in Boulder, to familiarize participants with the resources of both organizations.

For further information about NCSS and the 1971 convention, write to the national headquarters of NCSS at 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM ERIC/ChESS

Several new publications are now available, or will be available in the near future, from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. ChESS has joined the SSEC, the Political Science Education Project of the American Political Science Association, and the Center for Education in the Social Sciences of the University of Colorado in publishing Mary Jane Turner's book, *Materials for Civics, Government, and Problems of Democracy: Political Science in the New Social Studies.* Forty-nine curriculum materials packages, developed by 42 projects, are systematically analyzed from both an educational and a political science standpoint in this book. It may be ordered from the SSEC in paperback ($3.95) or hardcover ($5.95) and from the ERIC Reports/LIPCO, 4827 Rugby Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, in microfiche ($.65) or hardcopy ($9.87).

Teachers who are about to begin teaching economics at the secondary level for the first time will be interested in a paper, now near completion, by Suzanne Wiggins Helburn. This paper suggests how teachers might prepare to teach economics, presenting three possible frameworks for an economics course, background information, important concepts, and a highly readable annotated bibliography. A comprehensive state-of-the-art paper on economic education will also be published by ChESS as a sequel to this paper.

Alan Tom and Celeste Woodley have completed a paper on classroom observation and analysis. This paper, which is now being edited by ChESS, contains sections on "Reasons for Analysis and Observation," "Perspectives for Viewing the Process of Instruction," "Classroom Observation Instruments," and "Feedback on Instructional Skills." It provides thorough annotations for many major works on the topic.

A bibliography of social studies dissertations, 1964 through 1969, has been completed by Richard Gross and Leonardo de la Cruz. Each dissertation is annotated and indexed with ERIC descriptors. This bibliography will update the McPhie bibliography of 1964 and should be especially valuable to researchers and graduate students in social studies education.

Joanne Binkley, ChESS bibliographer, has completed a bibliography of all social studies materials in the ERIC system prior to May 1970, the date of ChESS's establishment. This bibliography represents a very thorough search of the ERIC system and should be of great help to educators requiring complete information on the social studies.

Readers wishing to brush up on their ERIC search skills will find Sharon Ervin's "Everyman's Guide to the ERIC System" quite valuable. This 14-page guide describes how to search effectively the thousands of documents that are available through ERIC. Step-by-step instructions, along with many illustrations, make the guide quite usable.

Single copies of the SSEC Newsletter are available to individuals free upon request. For bulk orders of the Newsletter for use in conferences , workshops, classrooms, etc., please remit 20 cents per copy ordered.